

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-11 are amended, and claims 12-14 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiners Lie and Wong at the interview held December 7, 2006, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

I. Formal Matters

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejection as it pertains to canceled claims 12 and 13 is now moot. Claims 1, 6, and 9 are amended to recite a document acquiring device to acquire a plurality of documents from an information source, according to a user-specific criteria¹, so as to obviate the §112, second paragraph, rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §112, second paragraph, rejection.

II. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 9 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Seki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143737); and rejects claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Seki in view of Wyard (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,398). The rejections as they pertain to canceled claims 12-14 are now moot. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as they pertain to the remainder of the claims.

¹ Support for this feature can be found at least on page 7, paragraph [0050], line 1 of the present specification.

Specifically, Applicants assert that Seki and Wyard, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a document extracting apparatus, including at least a document acquiring device to acquire a plurality of documents from an information source, according to a user-specific criteria, to be candidates for extraction, a similarity computing device to compute all degrees of similarity between the plurality of documents, and express the degrees of similarity in a *symmetric matrix*, a combination computing device to compute all combinations of any number of documents from the plurality of documents, a sum of degrees of similarity computing device to compute, with respect to *all of the combinations*, a sum of the degrees of similarity between all of the documents that constitute each combination, based on all of the degrees of similarity expressed in the *symmetric matrix*, and a document extracting device to extract documents constituting the combination with the smallest sum of the degrees of similarity among the plurality of documents constituting the respective combinations, as recited in independent claims 1, 6, and 9.²

Seki, in paragraphs [0046] and [0047], merely discloses that if retrieval results coincide with each other or if the coincidence of the full text retrieval results with each other is larger than 80%, the retrieval results are regarded as coincident, and that if the similarity between the summaries of retrieval results obtained with the contents of documents are summarized is not smaller than 80%, the results are regarded as similar documents and accordingly as duplicate. Seki, however, fails to disclose a document extracting apparatus, including at least a sum of degrees of similarity computing device to compute, with respect to *all of the combinations*, a sum of the degrees of similarity between all of the documents that constitute each combination, based on all of the degrees of similarity expressed in the *symmetric matrix*, and a document extracting device to extract documents constituting the

² Support for the features recited in claims 1, 6, and 9 can be found at least on page 11, paragraph [0059] to page 12, paragraph [0066] of the present specification.

combination with the smallest sum of the degrees of similarity among the plurality of documents constituting the respective combinations, as recited in claims 1, 6, and 9.

Wyrd also fails to disclose the features recited in claims 1, 6, and 9, and therefore, fails to make up for the deficiencies of Seki.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Seki and Wyrd, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a document extracting apparatus, including at least the features recited in independent claims 1, 6, and 9.

III. Conclusion

In accordance with the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 6, and 9 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-5, 7-8, and 10-11 depend from claims 1, 6, and 9, respectively, and therefore, also define patentable subject matter. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Bogdan A. Zinchenko
Registration No. 57,473

JAO:BAZ/hs

Date: December 21, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--